



# Problem Resolution Report

CoSD Contract No. 554833  
Service Level 27 – End User Satisfaction  
Revision  
Perspecta/CoSD 111

Peraton

**Date:** April 5, 2022

## **Summary:**

In accordance with the provisions of the IT and Telecommunications Service Agreement No. 554833 (the “Agreement”) by and between the County of San Diego (“County”) and Perspecta Enterprise Solutions LLC, a Peraton company (“Perspecta” or “Contractor” and hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Parties”), agreement is reached on the Effective Date shown below.

## **Issue or Problem:**

The Parties piloted a new End User Satisfaction Survey process from July through October 2021 to improve the survey process and response rate for Service Level (SL) 27 – End User Satisfaction after Service Performance. During the pilot, the Contractor provided monthly reporting based on the pilot requirements (i.e., response rate and overall satisfaction) and after the pilot, the Parties worked together to revise the SL metrics based on the pilot outcomes.

## **Resolution:**

1. The Parties agree to a phased improvement of Performance Target for SL27 as per table below:

Performance Target	SL Performance (%)
▪ May 2022 – April 2023: Percentage of Positive Survey Evaluations (score of 3 or 4)	▪ May 2022 – April 2023 $\geq$ 90.0%
▪ May 2023 – Onward: Percentage of Positive Survey Evaluations (score of 3 or 4)	▪ May 2023 – April 2025 $\geq$ 91.0%

2. The Parties agree that for any month where the End-User responses are less than the quantity needed to be a statistically valid sample (defined as a 95% confidence level with a 5% margin of error, using a mutually agreed calculator found in the public domain), the low volume condition provision as per Section 2.10 – Low Volume Conditions, of Schedule 16.8 – Fee Reductions applies.
3. Section 7.5 – End User Satisfaction, of Schedule 4.8 – Service Levels, is hereby amended as per Attachment 1 to this PRR.
4. Section 2.10 – Low Volume Conditions, of Schedule 16.8 – Fee Reductions, is hereby replaced in its entirety as per Attachment 2 to this PRR.

\*\*\*\*\*

The resolution of the issue or Problem as described in this Problem Resolution Report shall govern the Parties’ actions under the Agreement until a formal amendment of the Agreement is implemented in accordance with the terms of the Agreement, at which time this Problem Resolution Report shall be deemed superseded and shall be null and void.



# Problem Resolution Report

CoSD Contract No. 554833  
Service Level 27 – End User Satisfaction  
Revision  
Perspecta/CoSD 111

Peraton

All other terms and conditions of the Agreement remain unchanged and the Parties agree that such terms and conditions set forth in the Agreement shall continue to apply. Unless otherwise indicated, the terms used herein shall have the same meaning as those given in the Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, The Parties hereto, intending to be legally bound, have executed by their authorized representatives and delivered this Problem Resolution Report as of the date first written above.

## COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

By:

Name: John M. Pellegrino

Title: Director, Department of Purchasing and Contracting

Date: 4/7/2022

## PERSPECTA ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS LLC

By:

Name: Max Pinna

Title: Contracts Manager

Date: April 5, 2022

PRR 111 – Service Level 27 End User Satisfaction Revision – Attachment 1  
Schedule 4.8 – Service Levels

7.5 END USER SATISFACTION

<b>Service Level</b>	End User Satisfaction after Service Performance		
<b>Service Level ID</b>	27		
<b>Definition</b>	Measures the performance of the Service provided to End-User		
<b>Service Measure</b>	<b>Performance Target</b>	<b>SL Performance (%)</b>	<b>SL Earnback</b>
Positive Evaluation Percentage	Percentage of Positive Survey Evaluations (Score 3 and 4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Year 1 (May 2022 - April 2023) ≥ 90.0%</li> <li>▪ Year 2 and onward (May 2023 – onward) ≥ 91.0%</li> </ul>	94%
<b>Formula</b>	<p>Percentage of Positive Survey Evaluations = Total number of survey evaluations returned scoring 3 and 4 divided by Total number of surveys returned.</p> <p>Surveys will be rated on the following four (4) point scale: 1 – Highly Dissatisfied, 2 – Dissatisfied, 3 – Satisfied, 4 – Highly Satisfied.</p> <p>Internal Contractor tickets will be excluded from the survey population.</p> <p>Contractor shall calculate SL performance based on a statistically valid sample which is defined as a 95% confidence level with a 5% margin of error, .5% standard deviation, using a mutually agreed calculator found in the public domain:  <a href="https://www.qualtrics.com/experience-management/research/determine-sample-size/">https://www.qualtrics.com/experience-management/research/determine-sample-size/</a>.</p> <p>If there is insufficient number of surveys returned for a statistically valid sample for a given month, the low volume condition provision as per Section 2.10 – Low Volume Conditions, of Schedule 16.8 – Fee Reductions applies.</p>		
<b>Measurement Interval</b>	Monthly		
<b>Reporting Period</b>	Monthly		
<b>Measurement Tool/Source Data</b>	Survey data, ServiceNow		

## 2.10 Low Volume Conditions

### 2.10.1 Single Failure Results in Measurement Failing

A low volume condition exists where a single failure of an event-based measurement results in the measurement failing. The intent is to address the inadvertent creation of a perfection measurement when perfection is not the committed target.

For those SLs where there is insufficient volume in one Measurement Period such that a single Performance Target miss would cause SL Failure, that volume will be carried forward and accumulated for the next Measurement Period(s) volume on a rolling basis for that SL, until sufficient volume exists to allow for at least a single Performance Target miss without triggering SL Failure. Once that volume is reached, the SL is measured based on the accumulated volume and reported in the Measurement Period in which sufficient volume was reached. As assurance that low volume does not sacrifice SL performance, more than one failed Performance Target miss in the same Measurement Period, or in multiple Periods before the sufficient volume is reached, triggers SL Failure.

Example 1: Seven (7) out of the eight (8) incidents resolved in January resulted in an SL performance of 87.5% ( $7 \div 8$ ) against a target of 90%. However, since the single missed incident would cause the SL Failure, the volume rolls to February and there is no Fee Reduction in January. The two (2) incidents resolved in February met the target. The accumulated volume for February is 10 (8 from January + 2 from February) which is sufficient volume to allow for a single missed incident without triggering SL Failure ( $9 \div 10 = 90\%$ ). The SL performance for February is 90% ( $9 \div 10$ ), which meets the target. The accumulated volume resets for March.

Example 2: Six (6) out of the eight (8) incidents resolved in January resulted in a SL performance of 75% ( $6 \div 8$ ) against a target of 90%. Since there are two failed incidents prior to reaching sufficient volume, SL Failure applies in January and Fee Reduction is applied. The accumulated volume is reset for February.

Example 3: Seven (7) out of the eight (8) incidents resolved in January resulted in an SL performance of 87.5% ( $7 \div 8$ ) against a target of 90%. However, since a single missed incident would cause the SL Failure, the volume rolls to February and there is no Fee Reduction in January. The one (1) incident resolved February did not meet the target. The accumulated volume for

February is 9 (8 from January + 1 February), which is still insufficient volume to allow for a single missed incident without triggering SL Failure ( $8 \div 9 = 89\%$ ). However, since there are two failed incidents prior to reaching sufficient volume, SL Failure applies in February and a Fee Reduction is applied. The accumulated volume resets for March.

#### 2.10.2 Volume Insufficient to Meet Threshold to Measure SL Performance

A low volume condition exists where the volume doesn't meet the defined threshold to calculate SL performance. The intent is to address the inadvertent creation of an unmeasurable SL due to low volume.

For those SLs where there is insufficient volume in one Measurement Period such that the SL performance cannot be calculated, that volume will be carried forward and accumulated for the next Measurement Period(s) volume on a rolling basis for that SL, until sufficient volume exists to allow for calculation. Once that volume is reached, SL performance is measured based on the accumulated volume and reported in the Measurement Period in which sufficient volume was reached.

Example 1: 200 customer satisfaction survey responses were returned in January, which is less than the defined threshold is 378 for calculation of SL performance. The January volume rolls to February and the Fee Reduction does not apply. 200 customer satisfaction survey responses were returned in February for an accumulated total of 400 (200 from January + 200 from February), which is sufficient to calculate SL performance. The SL performance for February is 90% (360 survey responses with rating of 3 or 4  $\div$  400 survey responses), which meets the target. The accumulated volume is reset the subsequent month.

Example 2: 200 customer satisfaction survey responses were returned in January, which is less than the defined threshold is 378 for calculation of SL performance. The January volume rolls to February and the Fee Reduction does not apply. 200 customer satisfaction survey responses were returned in February for an accumulated total of 400 (200 from January + 200 from February), which is sufficient to calculate SL performance. The SL performance for February is 80% (320 survey responses with rating of 3 or 4  $\div$  400 survey responses), which fails to meet the target of 90%. SL Failure applies in February and a Fee Reduction is applied. The accumulated volume is reset the subsequent month.